



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,324	03/31/2004	Dan A. Duke	WETCO-001B	5165
7590 11/24/2004				
MATTHEW A. NEWBOLES				
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER				
Suite 250				
75 Enterprise				
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656				
		EXAMINER		
		HRUSKOCI, PETER A		
		ART UNIT		
		1724		
		PAPER NUMBER		

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MLV

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/814,324		DUKE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Peter A. Hruskoci		1724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/31, 5/6, and 6/29/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-26, 28, 30 and 32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 27, 29 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-13, 27, 29, and 31, drawn to a method for controlling scale formation, classified in class 210, subclass 696.
- II. Claims 14-26, 28, 30, and 32, drawn to a method of inhibiting corrosion, classified in class 422, subclass 13.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The method of Group I does not require the inhibition of corrosion as required by Group II, and the method of Group II does not require the controlling of scale formation as required by Group I.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Matthew A. Newboles on 10/18/04 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-13, 27, 29, and 31. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 14-26, 28, 30, and 32 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the specification on page 20 "harness" is erroneous and should be changed to – hardness –.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 13, 27, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyce 6,402,957 in view of Takahashi 5,403,521. Boyce discloses (see col. 9 line 25 through col. 11 line 59) disclose a method for controlling silica fouling or scale formation substantially as claimed. The claims differ from Boyce by reciting a specific step for controlling the conductivity. Takahashi disclose (see col. 5 line 21 through col. 8 line 46) that it is known in the art to detect and control the conductivity of an aqueous system to aid in controlling the introduction of a scale prevention agent. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Boyce by utilizing the recited step for controlling the conductivity in view of the teachings of Takahashi, to aid in controlling scale formation in the aqueous system. The specific conductivity utilized, and silica and hardness present, would have been an obvious matter of process optimization to one skilled in the art, depending on the specific aqueous system treated and results desired, absent a sufficient showing of unexpected results.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyce 6,402,957 in view of Takahashi 5,403,521 as above, and further in view of Oldsberg et al.

Art Unit: 1724

6,468,470. The claims differ from the references as applied above by reciting that the pH is elevated by evaporating or distilling a portion of the aqueous system water. Oldsberg et al. disclose (see col. 1 lines 25-42) that evaporation of contaminants during the operation of cooling water systems causes an increase in carbonate alkalinity and the associated increase in pH levels. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the references as applied above by utilizing the recited steps of evaporating or distilling in view of the teachings of Oldsberg et al., to aid in elevating the pH of the aqueous system.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13, 27, 29, and 31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 and 15-31 of copending Application No. 10/754,797. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the method steps recited in the instant claims appear to be included in the respective claims of the copending application.


This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (571) 272-1160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Peter A. Hruskoci
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

11/18/04